

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's final Office Action of November 1, 2006 the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment to the claims and the below Remarks.

Regarding Amendments

In the Amendments:

independent claim 1 is amended to omit the subject matter with respect to the printer incorporating portions of the document content scanned by the scanner but not contained in the digital version inserted by the Applicant's Amendment in Reply to the previous Office Action, and to specify that the scanned document also contains user input, that the detector detects a user request from the scanned user input and that the printer incorporates document content into the printing copy in accordance with the user request. Support for this amendment can be found at page 20, line 15-page 21, line 25 of the present specification;

new claim 9 is added reciting the omitted subject matter of amended claim 1 with respect to the user request; and

dependent claims 2-8 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments do not add new matter to the present application, nor any new issues to the prosecution of the present application.

Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-9 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by previously cited Mori (and/or Dymetman) in view of newly cited Lopresti et al. (US 5,754,308), for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, independent claim 1 has been further amended to recite the user input on the scanned document which is scanned by the copier. This scanned user input is converted by the copier into user requests for particular types of copies to be printed by the copier, e.g., a copy with or without further document content (see page 20, line 15-page 21, line 25 of the present specification).

On the other hand, Mori merely discloses several embodiments of an image forming apparatus in which an identification code on a page is scanned so that data associated with that identification code stored on the computer can be printed onto a recording medium with or without the identification code (see col. 3, line 17-col. 4, line 39 of Mori), and Lopresti merely discloses allowing a user to select the copy and output mode via a display panel (see col. 5, lines 46-52 of Lopresti).

Therefore, neither Mori nor Lopresti teach or suggest scanning user input to determine a user request for the type of copy to be printed. Furthermore, Dymetman does not make up for these deficiencies in Mori and Lopresti, because the capturing of user interactions on the marking medium disclosed by Dymetman is only via use of the pointer, which does not teach or suggest determining user requests for document copy types by a scanner of a copier (see col. 9, lines 1-23 of Dymetman).

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook



Paul Lapstun

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762